



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|----------------------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/814,527 | 03/30/2004 | Alpern Robert | RLY 04021.101 | 6886 |
| 58415 | 7590 | 12/16/2008 | | |
| SENNIGER POWERS LLP (ILPS) | | | EXAMINER | |
| 100 NORTH BROADWAY | | | LEVY, NELL S | |
| 17TH FLOOR | | | | |
| ST. LOUIS, MO 63102 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1615 | |
| | | | | |
| NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | | | |
| 12/16/2008 | ELECTRONIC | | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

| | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) |
| | 10/814,527 | ROBERT ET AL. |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |
| | NEIL LEVY | 1615 |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) NEIL LEVY. (3) ATTORNEY KATHLEEN PETRILLO.
 (2) ATTORNEY JANET HENDRICKSON. (4) GERRIT KLAERNER & RONALD KRASNOW.

Date of Interview: 09 December 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
 c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's described the polymers as able to remediate the bodies Na overload conditions as in the Claim 1 method, as opposed to the prior art polymers of less Na binding capacity. Examiner finds if claim 1 were limited to humans & the claim 16 polymers the issues of sufficient support for the binding of effective amounts of sodium to ameliorate the claimed syndromes & of anticipation or obviousness over the cited prior art would be overcome.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/NEIL LEVY/
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1615